

**CA-PMM****Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (D**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development C**Reporting Period:** From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_**Team Member to Project  
Manager****Current Task Summary**

Task or Deliverable	Scheduled Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Issues?
<b>Accomplished this week</b>			
<b>Planned/Scheduled Completion in Next Two Weeks</b>			
<b>Status Summary</b>	<b>Yes/No</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	
Will all assigned tasks be accomplished by their due date?			
Are there any planned tasks that won't be completed?			
Are there problems which affect your ability to accomplish assigned tasks?			
Do you plan to take time off that is not currently scheduled?			

**Status of Assigned Issues**

Issue Number	Description	Due Date	Status
--------------	-------------	----------	--------

## CA-PMM

**Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (D

**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development C

**Reporting Period:** From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_

## Team Member to Project Manager


**CA-PMM****Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (DynaSim)**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (ERCDC)**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09**Project Manager to Sponsor****Current Status Report**

Questions	Yes/No	Cause	Impact	Action Required
1. Were recent milestones completed on schedule?	No	User Acceptance Testing only partially completed due to technical issues	Minor Schedule Delay	Meet with contractor, identify test plans that will be completed to finalize UAT.
2. Were any key milestones or deliverables rescheduled?	Yes	Incomplete UAT	Minor Schedule Delay	See above
3. Was work done that was not planned?	No			
4. Were there any changes to scope?	No			
5. Were tasks added that were not originally estimated?	No			
6. Were any tasks or milestones removed?	No			
7. Were any scheduled tasks not started?	No			
8. Are there any new major issues?	No			
9. Are there any staffing problems?	No			

**CA-PMM****Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (DynaSim)**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (ERCDC)**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09**Project Manager to Sponsor****Look Ahead View**

Questions	Yes/No	Impact	Action Required
1. Will upcoming critical path milestones or deliverables be delayed?	No		
2. Do any key milestones or deliverables need to be rescheduled?	No		
3. Is there any unplanned work that needs to be done?	No		
4. Are there any expected or recommended changes to scope?	No		
5. Are there any tasks not originally estimated that will need to be added?	No		
6. Are there any tasks or milestones that should be removed from the plan?	No		
7. Are there any scheduled tasks whose start will likely be delayed?	Yes	Minor	None
8. Are any major new issues foreseeable?	No		
9. Are any staffing problems anticipated?	No		

**CA-PMM****Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (DynaSim)**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (ERCDC)**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09**Project Manager to Sponsor****Current Status and Accomplishments:***Describe deliverables completed and milestones met during **this reporting period**.*

- Completed Release 1
- Completed Release 2 Software Requirements Specification
- Continued to work on usability issues
- Held final walkthrough of Release 2 Design
- Completed Release 2 Design Traceability Matrix

**Project Milestones:***List key milestones and their dates from the project schedule.*

Milestone	Target Date	Forecast Date	Status	Cause & Impact to Implementation Date	Date Completed
Release 1 Development	4/16/09	4/16/09	Done		4/16/09
Release 2 Requirements	4/22/09	4/22/09	Done		4/22/09
Release 2 Design	6/4/09	6/23/09	Done	Design changes due to testing results	6/23/09
Release the Technical Project Manager RFO	7/20/2009	7/20/2009	On Target	Pending OCIO approval of Energy Commission IT Acquisition Plan	
Release 2 Development	7/21/09	8/14/09	Delayed	Delay in Design due to model data and performance issues	
Release 3 Requirements	8/7/09	8/7/09	On Target		
Release 3 Design	8/27/09	8/27/09	On Target		
Release 3 Development	10/2/09	10/2/09	On Target		

**CA-PMM****Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (DynaSim)**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (ERCDC)**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09**Project Manager to Sponsor****Variances**

Check the appropriate box for each project element listed below. Please describe the actions you plan to take for those items marked "Caution" or "Significant Variance".

	On Plan <5%	Caution 5-10%	Significant Variance >10%	Action Required
Schedule	X			
Milestones	X			
Deliverables	X			
Resources	X			
OneTime Cost	X			
Continuing Cost	X			

**CA-PMM**

**Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (DynaSim)

**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (ERDC)

**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09

## Project Manager to Sponsor

## CA-PMM

**Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (D

**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development C

**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09

## Sponsor to Executive Committee

### Summary Milestones and Highlights

<b>Project Milestones:</b> <i>List key milestones and their dates from the project schedule. Explain in issues section if a milestone's status is behind.</i>					
Milestone	Target Date	Forecast Date	Status	If Delayed, Impact to Implementation Date	Date Completed
Release 1 Development	4/16/09	4/16/09	Done		4/16/09
Release 2 Requirements	4/22/09	4/22/09	Done		4/22/09
Release 2 Design	6/4/09	6/23/09	Done	Design changes due to testing	6/23/09
Release the Technical Project Manager RFO	7/20/2009	7/20/2009	On Target		
Release 2 Development	7/21/09	8/14/09	Delayed	Delay in Design due to model data and performance issues	
Release 3 Requirements	8/7/09	8/7/09	On Target		
Release 3 Design	8/27/09	8/27/09	On Target		
Release 3 Development	10/2/09	10/2/09	On Target		

<b>Variances</b> Check the appropriate box for each project element listed below. Please describe the actions you plan to take for those items marked "Caution" or "Significant Variance". <i>* Priority of schedule, scope, budget, and quality from Final Ranking established in the Priority Analysis</i>				
	On Plan <5%	Caution 5-10%	Significant Variance >10%	Action Required
Schedule	X			
Milestones	X			



## CA-PMM

**Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (D

**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development C

**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09

## Sponsor to Executive Committee

Deliverables	X			
Resources	X			
One Time Cost	X			
Continuing Cost	X			

**CA-PMM****Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (D**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development C**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09**Sponsor to Executive  
Committee****Monitoring Vital Signs Scorecard**

Vital Sign	Variance	Value	Your Score	Score Justification
1. Customer Buy-In	High Degree of Buy-In	0	0 Green	Executive level commitment, Energy Commission staff participation, Commissioner interest
	Medium Degree of Buy-In	1		
	Low Degree of Buy-In	2		
2. Technology Viability	Strong Viability	0	0 Green	User testing through 2 releases shows technology working
	Medium Viability	1		
	Weak Viability	2		
3. Status of the Critical Path (delay)	<5%	0	0 Green	While design was a bit late, changes were due to technology findings during implementation. Release 2 UAT delay based upon performance issues that are being resolved.
	5% to 10%	1		
	>10%	2		
4. Cost-to-Date vs. Estimated Cost-to-Date (higher)	<5%	0	0 Green	Cost baseline not changed per SPR. Software development vendor is fixed price.
	5% to 10%	1		
	>10%	2		
5. High-Probability, High-Impact Risks	0 to 3	0	0 Green	Most risks identified at start of project have been managed.
	4 to 6	1		
	>6	2		
6. Unresolved Issues (on time resolution)	On time	0	0 Green	Change and Issue management meetings bi-weekly.
	Late with no impact	1		
	Late impacting the critical path	2		
7. Sponsorship Commitment	Fully engaged	0	0 Green	Sponsor involved as required.
	Partially engaged	1		
	Inadequate engagement	2		
8. Strategy Alignment	Strong alignment	0	0 Green	Tied to IEPF forecasts, bi-annual report to the legislature.
	Partial alignment	1		

## CA-PMM

**Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (D

**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development C

**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09

## Sponsor to Executive Committee

9. Value-to-Business	Weak or no alignment	2	0 Green	Report to the legislature.
	Strong	0		
	Medium	1		Enhance transportation energy forecasting.
	Weak	2		

## CA-PMM

**Project Name:** Dynamic Simulation Transportation Energy Model (D

**OCIO Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Department:** Energy Resources Conservation and Development C

**Reporting Period:** From: 4/1/09 To: 6/30/09

## Sponsor to Executive Committee

10. Vendor Viability (provide rationale for the rating in the field following the scorecard)	Strong	0	0	Green	See below.
	Medium	1			
	Weak	2			
11. Milestone Hit Rate (rate of achievement as planned)	>90% on time	0	0	Green	User testing for Release 2 only partially complete.
	80-90% on time	1			
	<80% on time	2			
12. Deliverable Hit Rate (rate of production as planned)	>90% on time	0	0	Green	Design deliverable for Release 2 was late.
	80-90% on time	1			
	<80% on time	2			
13. Actual vs. Planned Resources	>90% assigned and available	0	0	Green	Planned resources has not changed.
	80-90% assigned and available	1			
	<80% assigned and available	2			
14. Overtime Utilization (% of effort that is overtime)	<15%	0	0	Green	No overtime.
	15-25%	1			
	>25%	2			
15. Team Effectiveness	Highly Effective	0	0	Green	Team works well together, good communications, good identification of roles and tasks.
	Moderately Effective	1			
	Ineffective	2			
<b>Total</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>G</b>	

Green = 0 - 8

Yellow = 9 - 19

Red = 20+

### Vendor Viability Rating Rationale

The development team is comprised of Stanfield Systems, a well established software development contractor and Christensen Associates Energy Consulting, a well established energy analysis and model development firm. Both companies work well together and provide technical guidance to the Energy Commission regarding the possibilities, limitations and constraints of model development.